

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

January 25, 2000 LB 120

And that's the bulk of what our courts do right now. And I think that we can't continue to overburden the courts with the details that they will have to resolve, giving authority for saying, well, this is what the Legislature has said, you have this right; we have to decide these...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: ...these minute matters. And I think that we are really overloading the court right this minute with domestic matters, and this just adds another arrow to that quiver. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Pederson. Senator Brashear, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Mr. President, thank you. Members of the body, I rise in continued support of the bill and of the committee amendments and in opposition to the Chambers amendment. I agree with much of what is being shared, but I don't...I simply do not believe that it thwarts endeavoring to do better. The Chambers amendment specifically, I think, damages the bill by taking language where we say the court "shall", in establishing visitation, specifically take into consideration the importance of the parents' necessary work schedules. And, instead of saying it "shall" consider that, and consistent with the best interests of the child, it may or it may not do anything in response thereto, the Chambers amendment, by the use of the word "may", makes it optional whether the court considers it. Now as a fine point of law, we could argue that. But I'm simply saying that the Chambers language, "may take into consideration", is not necessary. There is nothing wrong with saying to the court it "shall" consider, consistent with the best interests of the child, this particular item of parents' necessary work schedules, and then allow that to enter into their decision, its decision, or not. I urge you vote against the Chambers amendment. The committee amendments, I respectfully suggest, do not put in any more detail than is necessary. Yes, if two parents agree, you can have almost anything and that's, and that's the objective that we ought to devoutly hope for. But we are dealing with here the problems that arise when we keep doing it the same old way. And if you